

TRANSLATION OF AN OFFICE ACTION
Of Japanese Patent Office

Re: Japanese Patent Application No.2006-537331

Dated: Feb. 26, 2010

Mailed: March 9, 2010

Due Date for Reply: June 9, 2010

The present application is deemed to be rejected based on the under-mentioned ground. If the applicant has any objection against this, an argument must be filed within 3-months from the mailing date of this application.

REASON

<Reason 1>

Claims 1 and 2 of this application do not meet the requirement under Japanese Patent Law Section 36 (6) (ii).

<Reason2>

The inventions in the claim listed below of this application should not be granted a patent under the provision of Patent Law Section 29(1)(iii) since it is identical with the invention described in the publication listed below which were distributed in Japan or foreign countries prior to the filing of the subject application.

<Reason 3>

The inventions in the claim listed below of this application should not be granted a patent under the provision of Patent Law Section 29(2) since they could have easily been made by persons who have common knowledge in the technical field to which the invention pertains, on the basis of the

inventions described in the publications listed below which were distributed in Japan or foreign countries prior to the filing of the subject application.

List of Cited References

1. JP 2003-299994 (D1)
2. JP2002-535499 (D2)
3. JP11-276953 (D3)
4. JP 57-180455 (D4)
5. JP2000-107666 (D5)
6. JP02-203976 (D6)

[Remark]

1. Regarding <Reason 1>

(1) Claim 1 recites “characterized by spraying member (15) for spraying water mist into the application chamber (P2)”. It is unclear how the spraying member is disposed for the application member. It seems to be necessary to specify at least that the spraying members are fitted in the vicinity of the inlet opening on one side of the web.

(2) For claims 2 and 7, the term “preferably” is not proper, since it makes the claims unclear.

2. Regarding <Reason 2> and <Reason 3>

(1) For claims 1-9

Please refer to Reference D1, paragraph 0024, Figs.

Reference D1 discloses a spraying member to spray moist air into the application chamber. It is difficult to find out any clear difference between the present invention and the invention described in Reference D1.

Further, it is recognized to be well-known technology from a person skilled in the art to prevent coating material from being dried and solidified by spraying

vapor or water mist, etc. as shown in References D2 – D5. Please refer to D2 (claims, description of p.7), D3 (claims, paragraph 0006), D4 (lower left column of p.2, upper right column of p.3) and D5 (paragraph 0013, 0024, 0034).

Further, Reference D6 discloses a method for cleaning utilizing atomized water mist having drop size of less than about 50 μ m.

Therefore, it is deemed to be obvious for a person skilled in the art to apply water mist spraying as mentioned in the well known prior arts to the invention shown in D1, and it is difficult to recognize any remarkable advantages in applying water spray.